



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,482	12/29/2003	Brian I. Marcus	EDU.026	8736

28554 7590 09/22/2005

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 MARKET STREET, SUITE 540
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

HARRIS, CHANDA L.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SUPPLEMENTAL
Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,482

Applicant(s)

MARCUS ET AL.

Examiner

Chanda L. Harris

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 4-22, 24-28, 37, 44-50 and 55-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 29, 38-43, 51-54 and 59-63 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/10/04, 12/14/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

In response to the Amendment filed 11/22/04, Claims 4-63 are pending. Claims 1-3 are cancelled.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: No continuity data has been provided on the first page of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 4, 13, 17, 24, and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities: "by the child" is repeated twice. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim does not have a period at the end. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

Art Unit: 3714

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 recites the limitation "the educational software" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

2. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the user" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

3. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 35 recites the limitation "the touch-sensitive surface" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 36-38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 36 recites the limitation "the educational software" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 4-5, 9-11, 13-14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-26, 28, 30-31, 35-37, 44-50, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood (US 5,511,980).

1. [Claims 4,13]: Regarding Claims 4 and 13, Wood discloses a toy housing supporting a planar work platform on which a child can make selections by causing contact across a planar surface of the work platform. See FIG. 1. Wood discloses a speaker (20). Wood discloses a processor (i.e., speech processor). See Col.2: 10-12. Wood discloses at least a portion of a sensing system, the sensing system sensing occurrences of contact caused by the child with the work platform without there being an incorrect selection of a letter, word, number or picture and the toy provides audio feedback to the child when such contact corresponds to the selection of a letter, word, number or picture, the audio feedback relating to the selected letter, word, number or picture. See Col.2: 48-54. Wood discloses a multiple contact learning mode including: a plurality of questions or instructions capable of being output by the speaker, the questions or instructions presenting the child with a problem which can only be correctly solved by the child causing contact with the work platform two or more times, the child indicating two or more cognitive selections by causing contact with the work platform two or more times. See Col.3: 5-9 and Col.6: 27-29. Wood discloses the processor enclosed within the housing receiving information from the sensing system (i.e., feedback) corresponding to sensed occurrences of contact by the child on the work platform in response to the question or instruction and using the information to evaluate whether the child's cognitive selections as indicated by the child caused contacts with

Art Unit: 3714

the work platform correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction. See Col.3: 5-9. Wood discloses a first audio feedback response output by the speaker where the processor determined that the two or more child caused contacts with the work platform correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction, the first audio feedback response (i.e., recitation) indicating to the child that the two or more selections by the child correspond to a correct response to the question or instruction. See Col.3: 5-9 and Col.6: 27-29. Wood discloses a second audio feedback response (i.e., error message or tone) output by the speaker where the processor determines that one or more of the child caused contacts with the work platform does not correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction, the second audio feedback response indicating that one or more of the selections by the child is something other than a correct solution to the question or instruction. See Col.6: 29-31. Wood discloses at least a portion of a sensing system, the sensing system sensing occurrences of contact caused by the child with the work platform and sending information to the processor corresponding to one or more sensed occurrences of contact and sensing the lateral movement of a child-caused contact across a face of the work platform while the contact is maintained with the work platform and sending information to the processor corresponding to the path of the lateral movement of the child-caused contact across the face of the work platform. See Col.6: 56-66.

2. [Claims 5,18]: Regarding Claims 5 and 18, Wood discloses wherein in the first learning mode and multiple contact learning mode, the contact with the work surface is object-oriented (i.e., uses indicia bearing units). See Col.5: 27-30.

3. [Claims 9,17,24]: Regarding Claims 9,17, and 24, Wood discloses a plurality of images (i.e., indicia bearing units) presented on the work platform to the child to facilitate the interaction between the educational software and the child, wherein the images presented on the work platform are changed from time to time, the processor being aware of the change of images without the child having to assist in advising the toy that the presented images have been changed. See Col.6: 44-51.
4. [Claims 10,21,36]: Regarding Claims 10,21, and 36, Wood discloses wherein at least a portion of the educational software (i.e., card) is capable of being loaded into the toy by the users thereof. See Col.6: 45-49.
5. [Claims 11,22,28,37]: Regarding Claims 11,22, and 28, Wood discloses wherein at least a portion of the educational software is capable of being loaded via a portable memory capable of being inserted by the user into a portable memory receiving device associated with the toy (i.e., card receiving portion). See Col.6: 40-41.
6. [Claims 14,25,31]: Regarding Claims 14, 25, and 31, Wood discloses wherein in the multiple contact learning mode and the movement tracking capability, the contact with the work surface is object-oriented contact. See Col.6: 44-51.
7. [Claims 19,26,44-46]: Regarding Claims 19, 26, and 44-46, Wood discloses wherein the work platform comprises a touch-sensitive surface. See Col.1: 67-Col.2: 5.
8. [Claims 30,35]: Regarding Claims 30 and 35, Wood discloses a plurality of questions or instructions capable of being output by the speaker, the questions or instructions presenting the child with a problem which can only be correctly solved by the child causing contact with the work platform two or more times in a particular

Art Unit: 3714

sequence, the child indicating two or more cognitive selections by causing contact with the work platform two or more times in a particular sequence. See Col.5: 29-33.

9. [Claims 47-50]: Regarding Claims 47-50, Wood discloses an alternative learning mode wherein the child explores letters, words, numbers or pictures by causing contact with the work platform without there being an incorrect selection, of a letter, word, number or picture and the toy provides audio feedback to the child when such contact corresponds to the selection of a letter, word, number or picture. See Col.5: 48-53.

10. [Claims 55-58]: Regarding Claims 55-58, Wood discloses wherein in the multiple contact learning mode, the problem can only be correctly solved by the child causing contact with the work platform two or more times in a particular sequence (i.e., spelling), the processor evaluates whether the child's cognitive selections as indicated by the child caused contacts with the work platform and the sequence thereof correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction, the first audio feedback response is output by the speaker where the processor determined that the two or more child caused contacts with the work platform and the sequence thereof correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction, and the second audio feedback response is output by the speaker where the processor determines that one or more of the child caused contacts with the work platform or the sequence thereof does not correspond to a correct solution to the question or instruction. See Col.6: 51-Col.7: 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8, 15-16, 20, 27, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Lee et al. (US 4,968,255).

1. [Claims 6,32]: Regarding Claims 6 and 32, Wood does not disclose expressly wherein the processor generates questions or instructions with different levels of difficulty. However, Lee teaches such in Col.6: 38-39. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate wherein the processor generates questions or instructions with different levels of difficulty into the learning device of Wood, in light of the teaching of Lee, in order to provide the capability of proceeding from one level to a next level.

2. [Claims 7,15,33]: Regarding Claims 7,15, and 33, Wood does not disclose expressly wherein the processor generates more difficult questions depending on the user having provided correct previous answers. However, Lee teaches such in See Col.6: 42-48. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the learning device of Wood, in light of the teaching of Lee, in order to in order to provide a condition for proceeding to a next level.

Art Unit: 3714

3. [Claims 8,16,20, 27,34]: Regarding Claims 8,16, 20, 27, and 34, Wood does not disclose expressly the multi-contact learning mode a second prompt specifically asking the child to try to respond to the question or instruction again (i.e., repeating the requested word to be spelled) in the event a selection by the child does not correspond to a correct response to the question or instruction. However, Lee teaches such in Col.5: 65-68. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the learning device of Wood, in light of the teaching of Lee, in order to provide feedback if there is an incorrect response.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 23, 29, 38-43, 51-54, and 59-63 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
2. Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Sharpe, III et al. (US 5,851,119)

-touchpad

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See rejection above. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3714

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-4448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanda L. Harris can be reached on 571-272-4448. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Chanda L. Harris
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714